DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 378 24 SO 003 184

TITLE	The Amherst Project. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Hampshire Coll., Amherst, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-5-1071
PUB DATE	69
GRANT	OEG-0-9-510158-2310-010
NOTE	40p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	American History; *Curriculum Development; Formative Evaluation; High School Curriculum; *History Instruction; Inquiry Training; Inservice Teacher Education; Material Development; *Program Descriptions; Projects; Secondary Grades; *Social Studies; *United States History
IDENTIFIERS	*Amherst Project

ABSTRACT

This final report submitted by the Committee on the Study of History at Hampshire College describes the Amherst Project, a research and development project devoted to fostering the newer inquiry approaches in the study of United States history. The project's main focus has been on secondary schools, but has also encompassed junior high and adult levels. In the report, project organization is examined in terms of the role of the Committee, the staff, office facilities, relations with sponsoring colleges (Amherst and Hampshire), and relations with the U. S. Office of Education. Materials development is discussed in terms of the unit approach, materials perparation, and relations with publishers. Also discussed are trial and evaluation of project materials, test development, the inservice workshops, and the Education Development Team Program. Following an overview of results of the Amherst Project are 7 appendices: a list of Committee members, a list of staff names, a list of units prepared by the Committee (1961-71), an analysis of units and unit structure drawn from reports of cooperating teachers, a chart showing project workshops, and a paper on the project workshops in discovery learning. (GC)

ED 066378

BR 5-1041
PA 24
SD

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FINAL REPORT

OE-5-10-158 (9/1/64 - 9/30/68)
OEG-0-9-510158-2310(010) (10/1/68 - 12/31/69)

Bureau of Research
United States Office of Education

submitted by:

Committee on the Study of History (The Amherst Project)
Hampshire College
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002

SP 003 184

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The Amherst Project, as it has come to be called, is a research and development project devoted to fostering the newer inquiry approaches in the study of history. While its principal focus has been on the study of United States history in secondary schools, it has found itself involved necessarily in social studies education broadly defined, and with age levels ranging from junior high to adult.

The grants which are the subject of this report were the chief support of the Project from September 1, 1964 to December 31, 1969. A first phase of limited activity had preceeded this work. Initiated by Van R. Halsey, Jr., then of Amherst College, this first phase of Project work went back to 1959. It was carried on under the auspices of the Secondary School History Committee, a committee of school and college history teachers in the Amherst area. It was supported by small grants from the Merrill Trust, the Wemyss Foundation, and the then-Four Colleges in the Amherst area, as well as by small advances on materials from D. C. Heath and Company. This earlier work was carried on chiefly in the summers under part-time direction, involved exclusively the development of materials, and had at most a local constituency in the Amherst area. The Cooperative Research grants which followed, and which are the subject of this report, enormously increased the scope of the Project's activity, making possible full-time direction, giving it a national constituency, and in innumerable ways establishing its character.

I. ORGANIZATION OF THE PROJECT

A. The Committee on the Study of History

The Committee on the Study of History (see Appendix A) was organized in the summer of 1964, concommitant to the beginning of work under federal funds, to serve in an advisory role to the Project. Composed of a distinguished and imaginative group of educators, historians, and social scientists from throughout the country, the Committee became a successor group to the Secondary School History Committee. It was and has continued to be chaired by Mr. Halsey. Meeting twice a year generally, either in New York City or in Amherst, it has served as an advisory body and a group to generate ideas. It has had no legal responsibility for the Project, nor has it been a policy-making group in the sense of a Board of Directors. Its members were chosen with a view primarily to the different and various perspectives they might bring to the work of the Project, as well as our sense (generally from personal acquaintance) of their ability to communicate effectively and interestingly with one another.

Members of the Committee have been exceedingly generous with their time, despite the fact that the budget allowed us to pay only the expenses of meetings, and all have served without compensation, some throughout all seven years of the Project's history. Their loyalty and commitment to the work has been an unfailing

source of strength, and their collective (and individual) imagination, wisdom, and good judgment has been a constant and continuing stimulus and aid to the staff, and most particularly to the Director. The meetings have been generally lively affairs, and the discussions provided, among other things, an invaluable finger on the pulse of American education, and constant aid to us in seeing the forest, and not the trees, in what we were doing.

B. The Staff

Partly through the accident of its origin and partly through design, the Project developed a method of staff organization unique among the curriculum projects of the 1960's. It involved a very small number of full-time staff and a much larger number of part-time staff who held other regular jobs but came together for particular activities such as summer writing sessions and workshops. (The staff is listed in Appendix B.)

Director of the Project from the beginning and throughout its course has been Professor Richard H. Brown, who had formerly taught history at the University of Massachusetts and Northern Illinois University. Mr. Brown ran the Project by himself, as the sole full-time employee, from September 1, 1964, to September 1, 1966. A second full-time staff position was created in September 1966, and thereafter Gary Baker (1966-68), Baxter Richardson (1968-70), and Thomas Newman (1969-71) worked, successively, as Assistant Directors. Messrs Richardson and Newman overlapped by one year, 1969-70, the only year in which the Project had a full-time staff as large as three. All three Assistant Directors came from the schools, Mr. Baker having been a teacher at Hamilton-Wenham (Massachusetts) High School, Mr. Richardson at Mt. Greylock High School in Williamstown, Massachusetts, and Mr. Newman at the Laboratory School of the University of Chicago. Their school backgrounds provided an indispensable and highly useful complement to that of the Director. All three, each in turn, ran the try-out program in the schools, maintained Project communications throughout the country, and worked with the Director in every facet of Project activity. The position was seen from the outset as a rotating one that would provide a unique experience and a broad view of the education scene to a young and promising school-man, while at the same time developing a growing core of people who had been closely associated with all phases of the Project. Mr. Baker subsequently returned to the Hamilton-Wenham School District as Assistant to the Superintendent and Director of Curriculum; Mr. Richardson went on to the University of Wisconsin to pursue his doctorate in the Training of Teacher Trainers Program; and Mr. Newman became Director of the Stockbridge School, Stockbridge, Massachusetts.

Executive Secretary of the Project throughout its course has been Mrs. Mabel H. Lumley. Working half-days, she ran the Amherst office from 1961 to 1971, and was in direct charge of the production and distribution of units, as well as serving as Permissions Editor. Given the nature of Project material (involving extensive use of reprinted items), the latter task was a particularly vexing one, requiring the development of great skill and wide knowledge of the idiosyncrasies of various publishers throughout the United States and abroad.

Part-time staff for the most part held down regular jobs elsewhere and joined

the Project for particular tasks, such as summer writing sessions and workshops. They brought to Project activities not only different kinds of expertise and different perspectives on the educational world, but a continued direct touch with the changing conditions and changing sense of problems in their particular sphere. These included the school classroom and school administration; college and university history and psychology departments; schools of education; and teacher training programs. Most did for the Project whatever needed to be done at a given moment, but some specialization developed. Thus Mr. Edmund Traverso, who had been a founding father of the Project while a teacher at Amherst High School and had written three of the earliest Project units, became Materials Director, working directly with the teachers who came to Amherst in the summers to write units; Mrs. Nancy Shaw Palmer has been Project Editor, providing an expertise made the more indispensable because most of the Project materials were being prepared by inexperienced writers; Mr. Robin McKeown organized and sustained the West Coast activities of the Project, chiefly in the San Francisco Bay area; Mr. George Cohan, Director of the M.A.T. Program at Wesleyan, has contributed his prodigious talents chiefly in the workshops; and the staff psychologists, Professors Rose Olver (a learning psychologist), David Schneider (a group psychologist), and Stephen Bank (a clinical psychologist) have contributed chiefly in the workshops and in evaluation and measurement tasks.

The staff system had the obvious advantage of flexibility. It enabled the Project to undertake a considerable range of activities at relatively low administrative and fixed cost. More important, it enabled us to bring to each particular activity not only a range of expertise and perspectives, but people who were directly involved in their "real lives" with the changing conditions in their particular areas. Only the Director and, for their two year stints, the Assistant Directors, became "professional project people," cut off from the going world of educational practice. The workshops and the summer writing camps, by their nature, provided excellent and regular meeting grounds for staff to come together intermittently and to continue to educate each other -- always with some specific common task at hand. The principal disadvantage of the system was that we were constantly short-handed for doing things that required carry-through work over extended periods of time. This was most severely felt in the task of revising and preparing materials for publication, a task which fell very largely on the shoulders of the Director, who always had more pressing things to do. In short, the freshness and vitality which the Project staff brought to each new task was bought at the price of not having a regular project "shop," and is reflected in the slowness with which Project materials have moved to publication.

C. Offices

The work out of which the Project grew had its origin in Amherst, but by the time the first USOE grant was awarded in 1964 Mr. Brown, who had been involved in the early work, had moved to Chicago. The grant raised the question of whether he should return to Amherst to run the Project from there, or whether to have the Project actually run from Chicago. The generosity of the newly appointed Director and Librarian of the Newberry Library in making available space and office facilities encouraged us to consider the latter possibility. Amherst College being willing, the decision was made to operate out of two offices, one at the Newberry and the other at the College. Behind that decision was the expectation

that a Chicago office would give us access to a much wider variety of types of schools in which to try the materials than would be available in the Amherst area, and that the Project would have greater visibility and connections with a broader educational world if it had at least one foot outside New England.

Curious though the two office arrangement seemed to many, it worked out superbly for the Project. The Amherst office was maintained at Amherst College so long as Project contracts were with that college, and thereafter at Hampshire. This office provided the planning and operational base for summer writing sessions, which were held each summer at Amherst College for the development of new units. During those months (July and August) the Chicago office closed down entirely and staff and writers gathered in Amherst for a regular writing camp, taking advantage of the fine accomodations at the College and the quiet and beauty of a New England summer. During the ten months September through June, the Amherst office was in the able charge of Mrs. Lumley, and operated as a center for production and distribution of units (taking advantage of the much lower production costs available in Amherst as compared with Chicago), as well as providing continuing liaison with the business offices at the two colleges, and with Mr. Halsey. During those ten months the Chicago office served as the Director's headquarters and as the center for the try-out of units, which took place in schools throughout the country. The two office arrangement was extremely useful in avoiding the regional parochialism which besets so much work in education, in maximizing visibility at low cost, and in affording the Project important contacts in the Chicago area and elsewhere. Daily mail, frequent telephone calls, and a close, effective, and warm working relationship between Mrs. Lumley and Mr. Brown kept the two offices together. The fairly large telephone bills were more than offset by the savings in staff travel costs occasioned by the fact that the director and assistant director were travelling from a Chicago base, rather than from New England.

D. Relations with Sponsoring Colleges

The relations between the Project and Amherst and Hampshire Colleges have been uniformly cordial, but never close. The Project maintained an office at Amherst College until 1969; thereafter Hampshire provided the office, first in space rented from Amherst College and thereafter on the Hampshire campus. The Business Offices of the two colleges successively handled the Project's financial affairs, disbursing money and keeping the books. The Mailing Room at Amherst handled the mailing of all units, a not inconsiderable task. Amherst provided an ideal physical setting for the Project's summer writing camps, including reasonably comfortable dormitory facilities for teacher/writers and their families, and staff; dining facilities; and access to a fine library along with some reference assistance. Most importantly, the reputation and good name of Amherst College gave us a seal of approval with school administrators and teachers everywhere we went, and opened doors for us throughout the country.

Three members of the Committee, Van Halsey, Peter Schrag, and George Taylor, were on the Amherst College staff when the Project began. Two people from the Psychology Department at the College, Professors Olver and Schneider, have been part-time members of the Project staff. Other than these there has been little connection between the Project and the respective college communities at Amherst and Hampshire. In many cases faculty at the Colleges scarcely knew that the Pro-

ject existed, let alone what it did: we have been better known in various educational circles throughout the country than to faculty "at home." Partly this doubtless reflected the disinterest in educational problems at the secondary level among faculty at liberal arts colleges: while we maintained an office at the colleges year-round, few made any attempt to find out what we were doing. It reflected as well the fact that most of the work has been carried on in schools and by school people in various places throughout the country, rather than at the colleges, and that the Director and his staff have worked out of the Chicago office rather than Amherst. These were conscious choices on our part. For them we have paid the price of not being able to draw on any substantial intellectual community to aid the work. This has been an obvious limitation and a continuing problem, but at the same time it has contributed to make us more pragmatic, more school-oriented, and less theoretical than we otherwise might have been. Whatever else can be said, we have not been a group of theoreticians sitting on a college campus planning things for the schools. In effect we created our own far-flung community of people, few of them at the college or university level, and we have worked in a variety of different places. This has had its advantages, and its disadvantages as well. It meant among other things that our work had little if any impact on the colleges themselves.

E. Relations with USOE

Relations with USOE personnel have been uniformly cordial throughout the history of the Project. The various Project monitors with whom we have worked have been, in every case, efficient, helpful, courteous, and interested. We have suffered no significant bureaucratic impediments in the day-to-day carrying out of our work.

At the higher or "policy" level there have been, however, problems. Our first USOE grant ran for three years, from September 1, 1964, to September 1, 1967. These were without doubt the most productive years in the Project's history. Thereafter we ran up against problems keeping the Project alive which were both time-consuming and psychologically debilitating. Between 1967 and 1969 we operated on one year grants, and at least one-third of the Director's time was spent on the interminable business of writing proposals, negotiating grants and budgets, and keeping afloat an operation which could not plan far into the future. To further complicate matters the base of our support in USOE had shifted, partly as a legitimate consequence of changes in our sense of the problems and what we needed and wanted to do, partly as a result of rapid changes of interest and priorities within USOE itself. We had started out to design new curriculum materials for history study, only to discover the practical necessity of developing programs that would help train teachers to use the new materials if they were to have any significant impact. This meant that to curriculum research and development we had added teacher training as a prime function, and this in turn necessitated our looking to a second Bureau in USOE for partial support. We never succeeded in bringing the two Bureaus together in our support, despite efforts that reached at one point to the Commissioner himself and to a meeting of the two Associate Commissioners involved, and produced numerous acknowledgements of the desirability and logic of joint funding. Until 1969 (the period covered in this report) we were supported wholly by the Bureau of Research as a curriculum development project, despite the fact that we were significantly engaged in teacher training,

a function in which they had little (and declining) interest. Since 1969 we have been supported wholly by the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development as a "training" program, despite the fact that they have had little interest in curriculum research and development and no official sympathy for (or programmatic capacity to hear) the message that grew loudly and clearly out of our government-funded experience -- namely that the task of curriculum research and development had enormous potential as a teacher training device, and that curriculum development and teacher training ought to be seen as two sides of the same coin of educational change. While our view was doubtless distorted by self-interest, it thus appeared to us that the bureaucratic structure of USOE impeded its capacity to make maximum use of its own funded experience. Only the creative energies and imagination of individual staff members at USOE has enabled the Office to continue to make any use whatever of this experience.

All of this might have been of no great consequence had the Project been a group of people all based on the faculty of a single institution, able to ride out time between grants. It was absolutely critical to the free-floating and far-flung operation we were carrying on, which per force had a life of its own or none at all, and which depended for the maintenance of communication on on-going tasks external to any institution but itself, and on the wherewithall for communication across distances. Eventually we tired of the task of keeping things alive and vowed, in 1970, not to seek further support beyond present grants until we had reorganized our operations and mounted them on a different base.

II. MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT

A. The Unit Approach

Beginning in the summer of 1961, under the auspices of the Secondary School History Committee, and continuing through the summer of 1970, the Project developed 68 units of study in annual summer writing camps at Amherst College, in addition to initiating work on a set of Junior High materials that were finished privately. 32 of these units were prepared in the summers 1965-67 under the successive Cooperative Research grants which are the subject of this report. The successfully completed units are listed in Appendix C. An additional ten units were undertaken but never completed.

The original goal of the unit approach was to design a series of units that might be strung together as a new American history course, based on the use of sources. Before application was made for the Cooperative Research grant in 1964 that goal had been abandoned, in favor of the alternative "modular" approach of building independent and self-standing units that teachers might use as modules or building blocks in designing their own courses. The modular as opposed to the "packaged course" approach was adopted as being both more flexible and more consistent with what increasingly came to seem to us to be the ultimate implications of inquiry learning for curriculum building: that curricular decisions should be made in each individual classroom by each individual teacher and by students, responsive

to the inquiries generated therein. It was a fundamental decision that guided our course of action and informed many of our decisions about procedure.

B. The Preparation of Materials

The basic method of preparing materials remained unchanged down to 1970, but we made refinements in it. Teachers were invited to apply for a position in the summer writing program, describing in their applications a unit they proposed to prepare, how they would go about it and what materials they would use, and why and in what way they saw it as making possible a significant learning experience for students. We selected from among the applicants, who numbered more than 200 a year from 1965-67, on the basis of our judgment of the promise of both the person and the topic. In several cases where we liked a person but not a topic we suggested topics to people and asked them for a substantive response; and in a large number of cases we took topics that had been proposed and refined them in subsequent negotiations with the person who proposed to prepare it. Nonetheless the initial proposal for almost all the units we prepared came from teachers applying to write, rather than from the Project itself.

Built into this mode of proceeding -- and into our selection of teachers, nearly 90% of whom were teachers at the secondary level -- was a significant planning assumption on our part that teachers themselves should be primarily responsible for the preparation of the materials. This assumption had its origin in poverty in the years before application was made for the Cooperative Research grant: it was cheaper to hire teachers for the summer than to put together a high-powered group of scholars who would decide what should be taught. But poverty was not the only reason for the decision to have teachers as writers. It combined with an initial suspicion, that grew over the years into a firm conviction, that materials of the type we were preparing should be put together by people who best knew and understood the users. (The more this conviction grew, over the years, the more it led us to increase the role in preparing the materials of the users themselves, i.e. the students.)

The summer writing camps generally extended over six hectic weeks of long hours and busy days in July and August, with staff staying on for an additional week or two to help ready materials for duplication. An average of ten to a dozen teacher/writers attended each summer, living with their families in comfortable college dormitories, with access to the College Library and complete free time to research and shape their units. Staff members worked closely with each writer. These included not only the Director but the Materials Director (Mr. Traverso), who spent full time with the writers, working with them on an almost daily basis; the Project Editor (Mrs. Palmer) who had final editorial responsibility for all units; and the Executive Secretary (Mrs. Lumley) who handled publishers' permissions and supervised the duplication of all units. The Project also provided the writers with research help in the form of a full-time Reference Librarian and (in 1969 and 1970) an Amherst College student who was both an imaginative and resourceful researcher and knew the Library well. Beginning in 1967 we also hired several high school students who joined the staff for the last three weeks of each writing session to serve as "reactors" and work closely with the writers in the final preparation of their manuscripts.

In the case of the secondary school teachers, writers were asked to prepare units with their own students in mind. The otherwise idyllic setting for work posed one problem for them in doing this: caught up in the excitement of research in their first few weeks on the scene they would sometimes tend to forget the students for whom the units were being designed. Hiring students as part of our staff, and making them omnipresent in the lives of the writers, helped to lessen this problem, albeit it never completely disappeared. In general the working procedure was for writers to spend the better part of the first three weeks doing their research and assembling unedited materials tailored to a tentative unit structure. Thereafter, for the last three weeks of the camp, the units were shaped, honed, and refined in a series of brainstorming sessions with members of the staff, as well as individual work with particular staff members such as our Editor. In the early years of the Project, especially before the Cooperative Research grant had made possible a full-time operation, units tended to be very much a product of each individual author's work. This changed as the staff grew in size, experience, confidence and skill in working together and with writers. Later units were much more a product of a collective enterprise, some more than others; and while we continued to attribute each to an individual author, partly out of habit and partly to maximize the incentive for good work, in some cases the "individual authorship" was little more than fiction and units were in effect prepared by Project staff.

Once completed, units were final-edited by the Project Editor, permissions secured by the Executive Secretary, and 600 to 1000 copies of each were duplicated for trial use in the schools. They issued forth from Amherst at the rate of about one unit every two weeks, from September to February, each year.

The summer writing sessions had one highly suggestive side effect which we had not anticipated, to which further reference will be made later in this Report. Even for teacher/writers who had to be helped over the finish line, or who did not finish at all, the experience of developing new materials proved to be enormously stimulating, an experience that altered the lives of many once they returned to their classrooms. For many it was the first opportunity to do genuine historical research, particularly along lines suggested by questions rather than with the task of writing a summary. Getting wholly immersed in the task fundamentally altered the epistomological assumptions on which many had always operated as human beings: it exploded once and for all the idea that history was a fixed bag of knowledge that could be "covered." At the same time the experience had another component beyond the mere doing of research. At each stage along the way decisions -- as to what materials to use, how to edit them, how to sequence them, and what to say in introductions and footnotes -- had to be made with constant reference to the question of what students might or would do with the resulting product. Undertaking a creative task constantly oriented to this question was also a new experience for many. For us as a staff, the cumulative experience was equally significant.

As our experience grew, we tended to develop out of it conscious theories of curriculum design and pedagogical strategy which informed subsequent decisions about what should and should not be done. Central to these theories was a focus on the learner and what it was we thought he might profitably do with the materials in the essentially social context of the classroom. The more we focussed on this, the more significant grew the distinction in our minds between the

"subject matter" of units and their content, the latter being the product in terms of human growth (skills, sensitivity, and "wisdom," as well as knowledge) that we thought might follow from the pursuit of some large and universal question of human behavior and human relationships around which each unit was structured. The subject matter of the units accordingly came to be steadily less conventional over time, with subject areas chosen more for what could be done with them than for their relationship to a traditional "cover the narrative" curriculum. At the same time the units came to be much more highly structured, and more precisely tuned to the pursuit into history of large and universal human questions that had potential relevance to students.

C. Relations with Publishers

An earlier set of Project materials, prepared with private funding and before the Cooperative Research grant, had been published by D. C. Heath and Company.

Materials prepared under the Cooperative Research grant belonged under the terms of the contract in the public domain and all have subsequently been made available through the Educational Research Information Center (ERIC) in both microficheand hard-copy editions. The public domain editions are, to be sure, expurgated of excerpted materials that were under copyright elsewhere and which could not, therefore, be placed in the public domain. Each such document is summarized in the public domain edition, with full citation included so that readers may go to the original.

Concurrent with the release of the public domain editions, arrangements were made with Addison-Wesley Publishing Company to publish revised versions of selected units, under policies established by USOE. These arrangements involved extensive discussion with a number of publishing houses, chiefly occasioned by our conviction that the nature of the materials demanded that they be produced and marketed as independent modules rather than as a package, and that individual units be produced in a looseleaf format that would symbolize their open-endedness and make possible adding and subtracting material and changing the order of use. Publishing houses, geared to the profit motive and traditional methods of production and distribution, were loath to do either of these. We won the battle for modular units, and compromised on the matter of looseleaf units, agreeing to the production and marketing of two alternate versions of all units, one looseleaf and the other bound.

III. THE TRY-OUT AND EVALUATION OF MATERIALS

A. The Cooperating Teacher Role and the Logs

The earliest Project materials had been tried out locally by teachers in the Amherst area. The Cooperative Research grant made possible a nationwide expansion of this mode of operating. We decided to work in particular geographical

areas, thus making it easier to visit and keep in touch with teachers who might be working with us. The areas on which we especially focussed were southern New England and the New York City suburbs; the greater Chicago area; and the San Francisco Bay area, including Oakland and Berkeley. Smaller groups of teachers working with us developed subsequently in Minnesota, the St. Louis area, northern Virginia, and the Greenville (South Carolina) area. We developed our initial contacts in the areas in which we had decided to focus by writing to teachers in each area who had been John Hay Fellows (Mr. Charles Keller graciously provided us with these lists) or who were graduates of M.A.T. programs at Wesleyan, Harvard, and Johns Hopkins. Through these teachers we met others in their schools, and still others wrote to us offering their services. Through this means we took on approximately 100 cooperating teachers a year in the various areas, offering them classroom sets of experimental units at no cost, but asking them in turn to give us detailed reports of their experience with the units. At the end of each academic year we "re-invited" for the next year those teachers whose reports had been most helpful, and added new teachers to replace the laggards. In all we have worked in this relationship with nearly 400 teachers over the years, some of them working with us year after year while others have helped out for a year or two at a time.

We avoided going to school administrators to ask for teachers who might help. All the teachers who worked with us volunteered their time, and in that sense they were a select group; but we made a conscious effort to select teachers who gave us access to a wide range of age- and ability-level students and to different types of schools. We succeeded to some considerable degree in this, although from the beginning it was the suburban school teachers who put up their hands with greatest alacrity, and who suffered the fewest administrative encumbrances in bringing "unapproved" materials into their classrooms. It was a struggle year after year to keep the urban schools well represented on the list. Where we did so successfully it was generally with teachers who took on the materials without going to their administrative superiors, a device that worked with the all-too-few teachers willing to do it, and which we gathered the administrators themselves generally preferred.

Teachers were invited to select the units they wanted to try from each year's list of new units, and they were encouraged to use them in whatever way they wanted, in whatever classes, and with whatever age- and ability-level students. To the extent that our supplies held out, teachers got the units they wanted, although we intervened in the process occasionally to make sure that each unit was being tried in a variety of situations.

We asked teachers to inform us when they expected to use units, and we tried to visit all teachers periodically while they were doing so, as a way of getting a picture of the situation in which the materials were used and improving our communication with both teachers and students. The try-out system was administered and supervised by the successive Assistant Directors of the Project, Messrs. Baker, Richardson, and Newman, working out of the Chicago office. All had been high school teachers themselves, and together they did much of the visiting. They were aided on the West Coast by Mr. Robin McKeown, a former teacher then doing graduate work in education at the University of California, who supervised the system there.

In the early years of the Project, before the onset of the Cooperative Research grants, we had generally asked teachers to "evaluate" units, getting from them as a consequence a good many value judgments about the materials but very little sense of what had really happened in classrooms, and little data that helped us learn. (What we were getting was the equivalent of what a student gets when a teacher gives him a grade.) With the onset of the Cooperative Research grant we explored at length with our staff psychologist, Professor Oliver, the possibility of using the units in control-group situations. We decided not to do this, as still not likely to tell us much about what happened to students except that one group had had one experience and a second had had another; and as not likely to give us any data except what was directly responsive to questions we asked, either implicitly or explicitly, in designing our measuring instruments. Accordingly what we asked teachers for was not evaluation as such, but an accounting of what happened, in as great detail as we could get it. We asked them to tell us about themselves, about the school and the students in it, about the particular course and class in which the materials were used, and about how the materials fit into it. We then asked them for a detailed log, recounting what happened in each day's class, day-by-day, as the materials were used, inviting suggestions for change and a final evaluation only after they had told us what happened.

Keeping the logs was time-consuming -- more so than some teachers thought they had bargained for -- and some obviously kept them in greater detail and with more precise observations than others. Over the years we refined the log form to maximize the information we got from it, and to make it both more clear to teachers and more useful to us. Despite the time involved, and the difficulty of the task for teachers, in the years that we operated under Cooperative Research grants we consistently got returns from approximately 70% of all classroom sets mailed out. The logs themselves provided us with strikingly vivid pictures of what went on in social studies classrooms, as well as rich collections of raw data about a number of things related to social studies education. Systematic analysis of them enabled us to plan much more clearly and knowledgeably the preparation of future units (see Appendix D), as well as the revision of those units being prepared for publication. Regular immersion in them taught us a lot about the world of education as well as about ourselves, and helped to shape decisions about other things the Project should be doing, including in-service training for teachers and subsequent programs of curriculum and staff development for entire school districts.

As with the task of preparing units, the task of trying them out proved useful for many of the teachers involved in ways that we had neither suspected nor been wise enough to plan for. The availability of free materials of a type quite different from the traditional ones many were using, encouraged many to reassess not only the other materials but their course goals. This was particularly so because the materials came to them frankly billed as "experimental," with teachers free therefore to fail with them, and able to ascribe failure to the materials -- where, in most cases, the blame doubtless belonged. Most importantly of all, the task of describing the conditions in which materials were used, and recounting what happened class by class, encouraged teachers to ask different kinds of questions of what they were doing than most educational activities in which they were engaged -- questions that stressed analysis of and empathy with

what was actually happening in their classes, rather than value judgments. For a number of teachers (though far from all) this was a significant experience, and it led some to alter in basic ways what they were doing in their classrooms. Teachers who had begun by plugging several experimental units into their traditional course, in a number of cases completely transformed that course over a period of several years.

B. Developing Tests

Our work to 1969 had convinced us that what was significant about the educational experience that we were striving to delineate and mazimize was the growth of each individual student in a number of ways (knowledge, skills, sensitivity, and "wisdom"), from the time he first encountered a given set of phenomena (in this case, a unit of our materials) until the time he put it aside. It seemed to us (and still does) that standard means of testing, all geared to measuring the student as compared with other students, does not provide this kind of measure. Nor is the value structure within school cultures able to make use of it. The difficulty in both cases lies in the fact that "growth" may go in different directions with different students, and in the case of each student begins at a different point. We undertook in 1969 to develop a different type of evaluation instrument that would enable us to test what we were aiming for, developing "pre- and post-tests" for five different units, each with a transfer dimension that would measure what students could or would do with what they had gained in similar situations. We tried these out in a number of different classes, amassing enormous quantities of data which were highly suggestive but which we lacked the staff time to process adequately. The experience convinced us of the enormous importance of developing such evaluation instruments, and also of the fact that it is a different (albeit related) world from curriculum development, one that is only in its infancy, and that will lack any large market until the culture of schools changes significantly to make it useful in what goes on there.

IV. IN-SERVICE TRAINING WORKSHOPS

The Cooperative Research grant in 1964 made possible, for the first time, a program of extensive visits to schools, observing and working with teachers who were using the units. Within a matter of weeks these visits had dramatized the need for us to develop in-service training programs that would help teachers who were eager to use the new materials, or which would at least encourage the development of such programs elsewhere. Out of this came a program of inquiry learning workshops for teachers that eventually became a major part of the Project's activities.

Two one-week workshops were held in Amherst in the summer of 1965. On the basis of our experience with these, we applied successfully for an NDEA Title XI Institute grant in 1965. Coordinated with the Cooperative Research grant, this provided for an "Institute on the Road," with separate one-week workshops in dif-

ferent parts of the country in 1965-66 and two more Amherst workshops (tied in with our writing camp) in the summer of 1966. In the Fall of 1966 the Rochester Public Schools and the University of Rochester School of Education invited us for a one-week workshop, as did the Dade Country (Florida) Public Schools the following Spring. These established the pattern for a program that eventually led to 22 one-week workshops, some supported by USOE funds and some by outside funding from school districts. Six of the workshops were held in Amherst and sixteen elsewhere throughout the country. (The complete list together with a breakdown of funding appears in Appendix E.) Three of the workshops, in 1968, were given at the invitation of USOE for Directors and Assistant Directors of NDEA Institutes in History which were given at colleges and universities throughout the country that summer. One, in the summer of 1969, was part of the training program for those who were planning the American Historical Association History Education Project teams, which were themselves to be dotted around the country.

The rationale and basic program of the workshops is summarized in Appendix F. Suffice it to say here, we sought to make the workshops themselves models of inquiry. Thus we avoided trying to tell people how to do things -- which we weren't sure we knew anyway -- and instead sought to provide experience that would both unsettle people and at the same time get them to ask different kinds of questions about and of their students, their materials, their teaching, and themselves. The heart of the method was experimental (not demonstration) classes taught each morning with bona fide high school students, followed up by a second hour in which the class was analyzed and pulled apart by the students, the teacher, the teachers who were participating in the workshop, and members of the Project staff. We repeated later in the day the same device of creating unrehearsed teaching/learning situations -- this time with the teacher-participants directly involved -- and having participants analyze them. Teachers were generally shocked, particularly in the mid-'sixties, at having students invited to analyze and criticize a teacher and a classroom experience. Where a workshop succeeded they learned, over the course of a week, to learn from students, or at least to listen to them; and they gained experience in asking real and honest questions of particular teaching/learning relationships.

Some workshops seemed to succeed better than others, or at least seemed to affect more people. Some seemed to us to have been failures. (Subsequent questionnaires, however, cast real doubt on the validity of our own subjective assessments as to which were most effective: doubtless too often we were reflecting what we thought to have been our own performance rather than what really was happening to others.) Each workshop and each group took on a life and character of its own. Many were enormously valuable learning experiences for us. When they ceased to be, or when we let ourselves fall into patterned responses to situations, we were in trouble. Over the years we developed some changes in procedure. Most notable of these was a steady growth in the time and ways in which we involved high school students. In the early workshops they participated two hours each day, solely to "perform" for the morning session; toward the end we had finally learned to include them as bona fide participants, and where we were able to make satisfactory arrangements, they participated full days and on an equal basis with the adults. A second change involved having participants teach one another in a continuing series of mini-classes. A third, which was of great significance, involved videotaping classes and using the videotapes for purposes of analysis --

the videotape providing a tool with enormous potential for these purposes which we had only just begun to learn to use with some effectiveness in the later workshops. In turn these changes in techniques involved us in changes in the scheduling and the ways we scheduled, until toward the end we were essentially altering and flexing schedules as we went along.

Particularly through the workshops for NDEA Institute directors, and in some of the other workshops as well, elements of our workshops served as models which were later adapted in other in-service training programs. This was particularly the case with our involvement of students in a direct and participatory way in the workshop, as opposed to having them present simply as demonstration classes.

V. COORDINATED CURRICULUM AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT: THE EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT TEAM PROGRAM

The Education Development Team Program which the Project launched in 1969 will be discussed at greater length in the Final Report to be submitted to the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, which financed the work. It was a program of coordinated curriculum and staff development offered on a cooperative, fund-sharing basis to school districts and/or groups of contiguous school districts interested in implementing inquiry curricular approaches in social studies education. Every aspect of the program drew on our previous experience. In a sense the program itself represented an attempt to bring together into a single implementation program various aspects of that experience, and to offer both the experience and the Project itself as catalysts for change. Each Team was drawn together and set in motion with a workshop not unlike our in-service workshops, including students, teachers, school administrators, faculty from local colleges or universities, and people from the community where appropriate. The subsequent "phase two" activity of each Team provided a follow-up from the workshop which had been lacking in our in-service programs. It extended over a year or more time period with each Team. During this period three teachers, working on released time supported jointly by the school district and the Project, developed experimental curriculum materials which other Team members in turn used and revised in their classes. At the same time we made available at no charge our own materials for the Team to use in its experiemnts, and members of the Project staff visited regularly to work with the Team in all aspects of its activity.

VI. THE RESULTS

Ours has been basically a research and development Project in which the research has been applied, rather than theoretical. In a quite literal sense the curriculum materials we have developed have been the tools of our research, almost more than they have been its product. With them we have sought to investigate

the question of how people learn, as well as a number of related questions having to do with the realities of school life, the problems and the role of teachers in fostering learning, and the problem of bringing about change both in educational communities and in the all-of-us who comprise them. The products of this research have been made available in a variety of ways: in the materials themselves, available both through ERIC and in published form; in the Cooperating Teacher program, and in our workshops and Education Development Teams, in which we have worked directly with upwards of 1000 teachers from coast to coast; in the writing of members of the Project staff (which has been limited in quantity but has received considerable response); and in lectures, conference participation, and various other professional activities undertaken by members of the staff, and ultimately by others who have been touched by the Project. The latter include, some touched more and some less (and many doubtless not at all), people who participated in NDEA History Institutes, in the American Historical Association History Education Project, in various committees of the A.H.A. and the Organization of American Historians, and in a number of individuals in both the history and education professions.

Questionnaires bear out strongly the not surprising fact that, in general, people have learned from the work of the Project in almost direct ratio to their role in or connection with it. Doubtless the person who has learned the most has been the Director. Those who learned next most were the Assistant Directors, who were directly and intimately involved for two year periods; thence outward to other members of the Project staff; teacher/writers who worked with us in the summer writing camps; cooperating teachers in the schools, usually in direct proportion to the length of time they used units, the number they used, and their diligence and thoughtfulness in keeping logs; and finally participants in the workshops, some of whom followed up by working with us in other capacities (such as writers or cooperating teachers), but others of whom disappeared after the week, and with whom we had no further contact.

The Project has been, generally, a low-cost operation, at least in comparison with many other curriculum development projects. It has been one of a number of projects which helped to foster what, in the 1960's, came to be called the "new social studies." These projects differed in emphasis and focus. Some were more theoretical than others. Some focussed more exclusively than others on the development of packages of materials and on the planning of cognitive tasks as defined by the materials and methods of particular disciplines. Some hewed more closely than others to the pre-existing order of school life, developing materials to be used within that order. Others, our own among them, were more willing to follow out the implications of their assumptions for radical school and educational change, and to involve themselves in a consideration of those implications. The collective impact of this work is just now, in the early 1970's, beginning to be felt in the schools, even as the simplistic "message" that many associated with the new social studies in the mid-sixties has passed out of vogue. The work threw a new focus on questions of how people learn, how school curricula could maximize that learning and what other elements of the educational system (such as teacher education) needed to be changed to promote this, and how to make social studies education genuinely relevant not only to students but to the needs of society as a whole. The new concerns that were pointed up by asking these questions in the 'sixties, and much of the experience that was gained, are

directly related and feed directly into present interests in open classrooms, affective education, the redefinition of student and teacher roles in formal educational systems, and education for relevance.

Hopefully the Amherst Project has contributed at least its share to this movement. The questions we have been asking still seem enormously pertinent; and the Project is still, in 1971, a learning experience of the first order for most of us who have been involved.

APPENDIX A

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE STUDY OF HISTORY

(Dates served indicated below name)

Van R. Halsey, Jr. (Chairman) 1964--	Director of Admissions and Associate Professor of American Studies, Hampshire College.
Wayne Altree 1964--	Chairman, Department of History, Newton (Massachusetts) High School.
Lee Benson 1964-1965	Professor of History, University of Pennsylvania.
Lawrence Chisolm 1964--	Professor of American Studies, State University of New York at Buffalo.
Alice Rice Cook 1964--	Formerly Director, Human Relations Center, New School for Social Research.
William Dietel 1964--	Associate, The Rockefeller Brothers Fund, New York.
Frank G. Jennings 1968--	Director of College Relations, Teachers College, Columbia University; Editor, Teachers College Record.
Geraldine Meister 1965--	Teacher of History, George Washington High School, San Francisco.
Rowland L. Mitchell, Jr. 1965--	Staff Associate, Social Science Research Council.
Saul Padover 1964-1969	Professor of Political Science, New School for Social Research.
Peter Schrag 1964--	Editor-at-large, Saturday Review.
George R. Taylor 1964--	Professor-emeritus of History, Amherst College.
William R. Taylor 1968--	Professor of History, State University of New York at Stony Brook
Lawrence Watts 1965-1970	Superintendent of Schools, Fairfax County (Virginia)

APPENDIX B

STAFF

Director:

Richard H. Brown, 1964--.

Assistant Directors:

Gary Baker, 1966-68.
Baxter Richardson, 1968-70.
Tom Newman, 1969-71.

Executive Secretary:

Mabel H. Lumley, 1964--.

Staff Associates:

Gary Baker, 1968--. Director of Curriculum, Hamilton-Wenham (Massachusetts) Public Schools; formerly Teacher, Hamilton-Wenham High School.
Stephen Bank. Clinical Psychologist, Wesleyan University.
George Cohan. Principal, Springfield (Vermont) High School; formerly Director, Master of Arts in Teaching Program, Wesleyan University.
Robin McKeown. Assistant Professor of Education, University of California at Riverside; formerly Teacher, Ygnacio Valley High School, Concord, California.
Tom Newman, 1971--. Director, The Stockbridge School; formerly Instructor, University of Chicago Laboratory School; Editor, Law in American Society Project; Assistant Professor of History, University of Illinois (Chicago).
Rose Olver. Associate Professor of Psychology, Amherst College.
Nancy Shaw Palmer. Formerly Editor, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
Baxter Richardson, 1970--. Training of Teacher Trainers (TTT) Program, University of Wisconsin; formerly Teacher, Hartford (Connecticut) High School and Mt. Greylock High School, Williamstown, Massachusetts.
David Schneider. Assistant Professor of Psychology, Brandeis University.
Edmund Traverso. Assistant Professor of History, State College at Boston; formerly Head of Department, Amherst and Hamilton-Wenham High Schools.

APPENDIX C

UNITS PREPARED BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE STUDY OF HISTORY, 1961-1971

Author's name in parenthesis; asterisks indicate units prepared with U.S.O.E. Cooperative Research funds and available through ERIC.

1961

Responses to Economic Collapse: The Great Depression of the 1930's (Edward H. Merrill)
The Ratification of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights (Peter Schrag)
Immigration: A Study in American Values (Edmund Traverso)

1962

The Negro in American Life in the Twentieth Century (William C. Ames)
The Missouri Compromise: Political Statesmanship or Unwise Evasion? (Richard H. Brown)
A Study in Jacksonian Democracy (Herman D. Lujan)
The Aims of the American Revolution (John M. Good)
The Progressive Era in American History, 1890-1914 (Allan Kownslar)
The 1920's: Rhetoric or Reality? (Edmund Traverso)
The Monroe Doctrine (W. Allen Wilbur)

1963

The European Mind and the Discovery of a New World (Peter Schrag)
The Abolitionists: Democratic Reformers or Dangerous Fanatics? (William C. Patten)
The First Transcontinental Railroad: Was the National Interest Served? (John O'Meara)
The Federalists and the Challenge of Power (David Brown)
The Spanish American War: A Study in Policy Change (Edmund Traverso)
Public Education in the United States: The School as a Reflection of American Life (Joseph E. Gould)
Reconstruction: Andrew Johnson and Congress, 1865-1869 (Gary G. Baker)
The Abandonment of Neutrality: America's Entry into World War I (John Campbell)
British Views of the American Revolution (Marjorie J. Squire)
Manifest Destiny and Expansionism in the 1840's (Allan O. Kownslar)

1964

An Idea in Action: The American Revolution as a Force in History from the 18th Century to the 1960's (Michael P. McCarthy)
The Tariff: The Shaping of a National Economic Policy, 1816-1833 (D.R. Lund)
The American West as Myth and Reality (William Allan Wilbur)
Freedom and Authority in Puritan New England (Allen Guttmann)
Korea and the Limits of Limited War (Edmund Traverso)
States' Rights and Indian Removal: The Cherokee Nation v. the State of Georgia (Allen Guttmann)
Series of Junior High School Units (A. Kownslar and D. Frizzle)

1965

God and Government: Problems of Church and State (Allen Guttmann)
Liberty and Security: The Communists Within, 1917-1965 (Gary G. Baker)

1965 (continued)

The United States, the League of Nations, and the Doctrine of Collective Security (George Cohan)
*Imperialism and the Dilemma of Power (Thomas F. Buffinton)
*Civil Disobedience, 1830-1850, and a Modern Analogy (Muriel Moulton)
*Social Relations, Pre-Civil War (Larry Cuban)
*The United States and the Soviet Union, 1917-1965 (Ira Gorman)
*Liberty and Law: The Nature of Individual Rights (Dayle A. Casey)
*Hiroshima: A Study in Science, Politics, and the Ethics of War (Jonathan Harris)
*The Civil War Soldier: Romantic and Realist (Jay Caton, Gerald Garland, William White)
*Conscience and the Military Obligation of the Citizen: A Problem in History and Ethics (Lawrence Minear)
*The Origins of Racial Discrimination in America: Slavery or Color? (Philip G. Farley)
*The Embargo of 1807: A Study in Policy-Making (Ralph K. Beebe)
Series of Junior High School Units (A. Kownslar and D. Frizzle)

1966

*Liberty or License: The First Amendment in Action (Murray Warren)
*Allegiance in America: An Inquiry into the Implications of Sovereignty and Citizenship (Dayle A. Casey)
*The United States and the Soviet Union, 1917-1965 (Ira Gorman and Robert McCarthy)
*United States Actions Toward China Since World War II: Evolution of a Policy? (Ira Gorman and Geraldine Meister)
*Science and the American Character (Jonathan Harris)
*Minorities and Prejudice in America (Frank Kane and Gary G. Baker)
*God's Providence in Puritan New England: An Inquiry Into the Nature of Ideas (H. Mark Johnson)
*Lincoln and Emancipation: A Man's Dialogue with his Times (Lawrence Minear)
*Who's In This With Me? The Individual and his Group (Allen Guttmann)
*Military Power in a Democratic Society (F. John Zarlengo)
*The Neutrality Act of 1935: An Inquiry Into the Uses of History (Edson F. Scudder)
*The Gospel of Work: A Study in Values and Value Change (William A. Kline)

1967

*What Happened on Lexington Green? An Inquiry Into the Nature and Methods of History (Peter S. Bennett)
*Polk and Mexico: A Study in Presidential Leadership and the Use of Power
* (Leon Hellerman)
*The Supreme Court and the Dynamics of American Government (Stephen R. Holman)
*Property in America: The Balance of Private Rights and Public Interest (William A. Kline)
*The Vote as a Measure of Participation in American Society (Joseph F. LaValley, Jr.)
*Citizens Behind Barbed Wire: The Japanese Relocation and Democratic Ideals in Total War (Paul Zimmerman)
*Why Watts? An American Dilemma Today (Carol Vogt)
*Democracy and its Servants: A Study in Allegiance and Responsibility (William G. Byrne)
*Ideals and Reality in Foreign Policy: American Intervention in the Caribbean (Alfred Jamieson)

1969

The Tactic of Violence: John Brown's Raid (John C. Conroy)
Poverty and the Quality of American Life (Robert D. Kuklis)
Sacco-Vanzetti: The Relationship of Freedom to Justice (Baxter Richardson)
The Disenchanted: Youth in American Society (Deane C. Thompson)
Strangers in the City: The Black and Immigrant Experience (Richard H. Dollase)
Black Freedom: Its Meaning After One Hundred Years (Thomas Ladenburg, Caroline D. Cooper, Baxter Richardson)

1970

Round Valley Indian Reservation: A Study in Ethnocentricity (Stephen R. Holman)
The Limits of Wartime Dissent: A Case Study of the Copperheads in the Civil War (William A. Doubleday and Jamison V. V. Wilcox)

APPENDIX D

ANALYSIS OF UNITS AND UNIT STRUCTURE

DRAWN FROM THE REPORTS OF COOPERATING TEACHERS

I. Introductions to the Units

The introductions are designed to identify the over-all question posed by the unit in such a way that the students see it as important and relevant to their lives. These introductions must be concise, clear and short enough to be read easily in one assignment and discussed in one class period. The hope is that the students will raise the questions with which they will cope or develop hypotheses which they will test throughout the unit. In short, the successful introduction does two things: (1) identifies the point of the unit; and (2) motivates the students to be concerned with this general problem.

The introductions can be characterized in different ways. (1) Some are essentially descriptions of incidents that illuminate the issue at point. Our example of this is the introduction to the unit entitled "Why Watts?" where the incident that touched off the riot is described. (2) Some have short quotations, often contradictory, concerning the main thesis of the unit, as in the "Lincoln and Emancipation" unit where different men voice their opinions as to the extent to which man can control events. (3) Other introductions open with a generalization on the topic of the unit which is then challenged or illuminated by a concrete example. The "Liberty and Security" unit, for example, starts out with a statement by Justice Holmes on "clear and present danger" which is then followed by an official statement by the American Communist Party threatening the overthrow of the government of the United States. (4) A fourth type of introduction starts out with a statement that is challenging to contemporary or traditional American values, such as Robert Theobald's suggestion for a guaranteed annual wage in the "Gospel of Work" unit. (5) Yet another kind asks the student to assess his own understanding of the central problem raised by the unit or to assess his own values on the subject in point. In the "Minorities and Prejudice in America" unit, for example, a test of values is given concerning attitudes toward different ethnic or racial groups. (6) In a few instances the introductions are brief descriptions of the problem or general question with which the unit will deal written by the compiler of the unit. They serve merely to identify the point of the unit and leave it for the opening section to motivate the students to pursue the problem further.

None of the different types of introductions seemed to be total failures in all classrooms. There did seem to be a unanimous approval of the type of introduction mentioned first, i.e. that which describes an incident which is of interest to students and which at the same time helps to identify the problem with

which the unit is concerned. Invariably the concrete, concise description of believable human beings acting in realistic and sometimes dramatic situations seems to catch the interest of students, no matter what their age or ability level. And when the introduction moved from a concrete example to a consideration of the nature of the problem that is to be presented it also seemed to help students focus their attention on the central issue and see its relevance to their own lives.

The other types of introductions seemed to depend for their success on the nature of the classes using them and the manner in which they were used. For instance, in the case of the second type of introduction, the quotations were often on such an abstract level that they could be handled well only by the brighter, better read students who had already developed a background in the subject area. Those who understood what the men being quoted were talking about often got into superb discussions which forced them to realize how little they knew. When they were then asked to develop a tentative hypothesis or to formulate specific questions to be tested throughout the rest of the unit, they seemed to have gotten off on the right foot. If the teacher allowed students to speculate on the ideas only in general terms and never asked them to go beyond the abstract idea to formulate a specific question that could be examined throughout the rest of the unit, nothing seemed to be gained. On the other hand, when the teacher forced students to commit themselves to a particular stand, it seemed to open the door to trouble. Students would either blind themselves to other views developed later on in the unit because they had identified themselves with a particular opinion or would shrink back into embarrassed silence when the view they had espoused was later proven to be erroneous or naive. Nor was it always wise to ask the student to try to define a broad abstraction such as "history" or "greatness" when they had had little experience in discussing such big ideas or in relating them to concrete examples. Occasionally this proved to be a useful exercise when it helped the students to see the magnitude or realize the difficulty of the problem at hand, but too often students balked when asked to define large ideas, and the discussion subsequently dragged or fell back to meaningless exchange of opinions as to which quotation each student liked best for whatever reason that then came to mind. In short, asking students to speculate in abstract terms about an abstract idea for a whole class period or forcing them to commit themselves to take a stand or espouse a particular opinion that would later prove to be questionable was a technique which did not often work well. The abstract introduction seemed to serve its purpose better when the students were asked to develop a tentative hypothesis or to raise questions that they would then try to answer throughout the rest of the unit. One tactic that seemed to work well was asking students what they needed to know before they could develop a well-founded opinion.

The third type of introduction, that which related an abstract generalization to a concrete incident or statement, helped to move the discussion away from the realm of indefinable speculation, but the relationship between the abstract and the concrete was sometimes confusing to students. They had to be able to grasp the meaning of the generalization, which is not always easy, before they could relate it intelligently to the concrete case. Quite often the students saw the generalization as the answer to the problem which, in effect, put blinders on the students. This also happened with some introductions described in the previous paragraph, especially in those instances where one opinion was placed between two others (e.g. Hegel in the "Lincoln" unit) or was the only view prominently presented (e.g. several students thought they were supposed to conclude that Polk was a Machiavellian leader in the "Polk and Mexico" unit because Machiavelli was quoted in the introduction).

The fourth type of introduction, a statement challenging American values, seems to motivate students very well. After the immediate reaction, they are frustrated by a lack of good evidence to the contrary, which gets them nicely into the unit. This type of approach seemed to be second only to the description of an incident in getting students involved, though it did not work as well with students of lower ability or those from a lower economic class who often don't share traditional American values or who don't take impersonal schemes or indictments personally or seriously. It is simply harder for them to translate generalizations into concrete or personal instances or to identify with the people who might be affected unless these people are described in personal terms.

The fifth type of introduction mentioned, the self-assessment, leads the students directly into personal concerns and is probably the best method of having them see how the central problem of the unit is related to them. The difficulty is, however, that this becomes so personal that students often become defensive or try to create an impression which is not always accurate. As long as they are not put on the spot in class and are allowed to examine their views privately and talk about all opinions in general terms, this method seems to be an excellent way to "hook" the students, though there is a danger that after talking about a problem in personal terms it will be difficult for students to become interested in the issue in historical terms.

The last type of introduction, the brief description of the problem or central issue of the unit as stated by the author, evoked little comment one way or the other. Usually teachers viewed the opening section of such units as the real opener and would criticise or praise that, rather than the introduction itself. In one unit, however, the compiler did not clearly identify the point of the unit and was criticised for vagueness.

In summary, it would seem that the best way to introduce a unit is to make its central concern concrete and personal. Students should be encouraged to raise questions but should be warned against offering answers. The introduction should be viewed as the beginning of a new pursuit into an important and intriguing problem, not the opening for a defense of a preconceived judgment.

II. Editorial Commentary

The purpose of all editorial comment in the units is to provide such contextual information as is necessary so that the students can read the documents with some background and perspective. The units contain different types of editorial comment: introductions to the unit as a whole; introductions to each of the sections of the unit which provide the general context for the documents that follow as well as provide a smooth and logical transition from previous sections; introductions to each of the documents which provide in concise terms the information the student will need to understand what it is that he is about to read, e.g. author, time, place, and/or pertinent circumstances; explanatory footnotes which clarify unfamiliar words, persons, ideas, titles, etc.; and finally suggestions for further reading pertinent to the unit, usually found at the end of each unit.

The task facing the compilers of the units is to provide the necessary background information while at the same time not providing answers which can be found in the documents nor revealing interpretations or judgments of either the compiler of the unit or the authors of the various documents. Most of the criticism of the editorial comment in the units contended that the compiler had gone

to one extreme of the other: either too much editorial material was included or too little.

Those teachers who felt that certain units did not provide sufficient contextual background for the documents contended that certain people referred to in the unit should be identified more thoroughly; that certain unfamiliar terms or phrases should be defined; that institutions referred to in a unit (e.g. the Supreme Court or the Civil Service) should have their processes and functions more thoroughly explained; that maps of relevant geographical areas should be included; that more information on the historical context was needed for some of the documents.

Some teachers felt that specific questions should be included in the introductions to each section or document to help the students, especially the slower learners, focus on the reading. Others felt that such questions should be provided in the Teachers Manual, so that teachers would be allowed the flexibility of using the questions or not depending on the needs of their students. Many teachers felt that students should learn how to formulate their own questions and that such questions as were already provided in the Students Manual often prevented the acquiring of this skill. When questions were provided in the Students Manual, as they often were in units for slow learners, there were often complaints from both students and teachers that they were "silly," "elementary," or "insulting."

There was also a feeling that the questions as to extent of an introduction, and the advisability of including helpful questions or points to consider, depended on the difficulty of the section or document at issue. For instance, many teachers felt that students needed a good deal more help than usual when being introduced to legal decisions or sophisticated explanations by experts in particular fields. The teachers who complained about the length or nature of the editorial comment provided also complained about the editor "giving away" the evidence provided in the documents themselves or accused him of building a case for a particular viewpoint and of using unnecessarily difficult or sophisticated vocabulary. One teacher maintained that there is "never a need for big words in introductions."

The tone of the editorial comment is crucial. Introductions which talked down to students or appeared to be patronizing were enough to turn both teachers and students against a unit. Those introductions which were written as they would be if intended for adults but which at the same time were not technical or bombastic seemed to get the warmest receptions from students. There was also a feeling from some teachers that the editorial matter could be more personal, lively, and less "textbookish." Others felt that other types of media--movies, audiotapes, records--were needed to provide a more human context, and many added such material whenever it was even remotely relevant to the unit.

Some teachers complained that some units did not do a good enough job at providing a transition from one section to another. Both students and teachers occasionally complained that they could not see how one section related to another and that the point of each section in relation to the larger purpose of the unit was not always clarified. This, of course, is not easy to do without giving away an answer that the compiler of the unit imagined the students would come to after reading the section. But the most effective units seemed to handle this problem by identifying the larger question of the unit in an increasingly sophisticated and complex way as it moved from one section to another.

Curiously, some students complained that the footnotes were "interruptions" and preferred that they be placed at the end of the unit. But most students ap-

preciated them. One might suspect that those students who appreciated the footnotes had learned how to use them. They read the units consciously as an intellectual exercise rather than as a novel. Those who didn't like the footnotes often complained that the units were not enough like stories (see the section on General Organization).

Although little was said overtly about the "Suggestions for Further Reading" at the end of the units, it would seem that these were not used as much as possible. The descriptions of the books were not sufficiently detailed to give students some clues as to what questions might be answered in them. Several teachers suggested that a bibliography should be included at the end of each section and even that the relevant chapters of books should be listed. Other teachers complained that many of the books suggested were too difficult for high school or junior high school students and that the degree of difficulty of each book should be mentioned. One critic suggested that more works of fiction, poetry, art and biography should be included.

In summary, the writing of editorial comment is, indeed, an art, for the author can easily say too much or too little; be too sophisticated or too condescending; be helpful to some and offensive to others. The audience he must keep in mind is so heterogeneous that he can hardly expect to meet the needs of all, but he must try or risk shutting off the interest of the readers before they have really begun to inquire into the hearts of the units--the documents.

III. Documents

The documents provide the evidence with which the students deal in inquiring into the problem raised in the unit. They must be sufficient in number and depth to allow students to make well-informed conclusions but not so numerous or long that the students become discouraged. There are seemingly endless types of documents which are used in the units. Some of the most frequently used are: speeches, official and personal letters; official documents such as treaties, laws, bills, etc.; newspaper and magazine articles; selections from books, both fiction and nonfiction; reports of interviews; poems and musical lyrics; statistical charts; Congressional debates; reports by investigating committees or exploratory ventures; diaries; legal decisions; memoirs and biographies.

It is noteworthy that the documents that the students found most interesting and instructive were those which were least like textbooks in both style and substance. Documents with interpretive conclusions that dealt in the realm of abstract generalization seemed to be the least interesting or illuminating for students. Documents which dealt in personal terms with human beings acting in concrete circumstances seemed to be universally appealing but in and of themselves seldom added a new dimension to the students' thinking. Student reports were almost unanimous in indicating appreciation for having the opportunity to think through a problem inductively by using original sources or sources of interpretation that disagreed on an issue.

The primary task for the unit compiler is to find representative samplings of the evidence that historians would use in researching the problem which are not so sophisticated, technical or detailed that they are beyond the ability or motivation of secondary school students. The major way to cut down on the length of the documents is editing them to exclude all extraneous passages. Despite attempts to keep the documents only as long as necessary, one of the most frequent complaints

from both teachers and students was the length of documents. An attempt to have the unit authors identify the exact point of a document in relation to the larger purpose of the unit was helpful in limiting the length of the selections.

It can be said that in general students tended to enjoy most and comprehend best those sources which were personal and concrete (such as descriptions of incidents, personal letters, and diaries) and had the most difficulties with impersonal, abstract, and technical sources such as legal reasoning in court decisions and abstract reasoning by experts in a particular field, e.g. political philosophers, sociologists. As long as they were not too abstract or technical, controversial articles or sources presenting intellectual conflict seemed to motivate students significantly. Students seemed to appreciate sources which illuminated the personal struggles faced by various individuals that allowed students to get to know a person as a human being, such as was the case in the units on Lincoln and Polk.

This is not to say that students did not welcome documents that raised profound philosophical questions about life. Such documents, as long as they could be understood, often led to a great deal of insight and moving discussions. One such document is Plato's Allegory of the Cave in the "Lexington" unit, which was easily read by most students. This was effective because at first it seemed to students to be on a very concrete level but invariably led to abstract discussions in the students' own time and terms. Too often teachers were scared away by this selection, convinced that Plato was beyond their particular students. In a number of instances, students begged teachers to let them read and discuss it. At that stage in the unit they were ready for it, even though the teachers weren't always ready.

It also should not be assumed that all technical articles,such as Supreme Court reasoning in legal cases, have to be avoided. According to the reports from co-operating teachers, however, what must be kept in mind is that subtle and sophisticated reasoning by experts is often beyond average high school students, unless it is placed in a concrete human context. One example of the successful use of a Supreme Court decision is the "Liberty and Law" unit, which presented the Gideon case in human terms by quoting from the book on the case, Gideon's Trumpet, in such a way that it illuminated the relationship between abstract law and a human being for which the students could have sympathy. Articles in news magazines or newspapers which report, quote and explain court decisions often appeared to be the best resort in presenting difficult and highly complex decisions. In some instances, as in the case of Justice Douglas, the style of the writer is clear enough so that it seemed appropriate for the students. Students also appreciated decisions which were somewhat anecdotal.

The style of the author is often enough to make or kill a document. This is, of course, the difficulty with pre-20th Century English, especially Puritan language. Unless the Puritan document was short and to the point, or else colorful, students had a hard time comprehending it. Some teachers were forced to translate for students, which was not always bad as students often caught on to the language themselves before the end of the unit. Despite the difficulties of language, once the point of the documents was understood, fruitful discussions and increasingly sophisticated inquiries ensued. Some styles, such as James Fenimore Cooper's, bored students. Some, such as Mencken's, used vocabulary that was overwrought. Others were simply talking about matters beyond students' comprehension. But as some teachers pointed out, such articles often made important, if not indispensable points that could not be excluded, points which might be made clearer by somebody else, but ones that nevetheless had to be made. In such in-

stances the teacher or an advanced student often explained what the point was and how it was made. Such exercises were often all for the good as English teachers and teachers in other classes mentioned to the history teachers that students seemed to be comprehending the reading selections in their classes much better since reading and using documents in history. In a few instances with slower learning classes, tape recordings of someone reading the documents were made and played to the students while they followed along with the text. This resulted in noticeable improvements in attention and comprehension. Some scholars, such as Schlesinger, Hofstadter, Allen, or Galbraith, have entertaining enough styles to be able to communicate with most average and above average students.

It was clear from the reports submitted both by teachers and students that some documents did not serve well the purpose the compiler had in mind because references in them were simply not within the realm of the students' experience. Sophisticated humor that amused teachers often only served to irritate students because they didn't understand it. References to people or ideas that were foreign to students (and yet referred to in such a way that to ask what they were would have been embarrassing) tended to irk them. Extremist views generally tended to be scoffed at, though often students knew little of the history and nature of the extremist view, whereas teachers seemed to assume that they did. Official documents tended to bore students, partly because they knew little of the human drama and intriguing circumstances behind the scenes and partly because they were often not asked to go to the document with a question that would help give insight into the larger problem of the unit. They were sometimes infuriated by "the dots" that represented deletions, convinced as some were that the editor had left out some crucial point or was trying to avoid evidence that would build a case supporting to their own view. Teachers and students complained of one unit in particular, "Liberty or License," because the reasoning behind a court decision was deleted and yet were upset with another, "Liberty and Security," when the reasoning in some court cases was beyond their comprehension. They were sometimes bored by diplomatic correspondence because references were occasionally made to circumstances of which they had no previous knowledge. They liked case studies, except when they referred to conditions with which they were not familiar. They usually felt that they were being given adequate evidence of the views of public officials, but frequently wanted more direct evidence of the opinions of the general public, the "common people." For instance, there seemed to be unanimous appreciation of the reports on interviews with the general public in "The Vote" unit and the "Liberty and Security" unit. They sometimes complained because they thought that foreign views were given short shrift in some of the units on diplomatic history. In short, whether a document was effective or not often depended on the extent to which the students had been prepared by preceeding documents that provided a broad context, by introductions and footnotes, or by information supplied by the teacher or by supplementary books.

One major difficulty, however, was encountered with those selections which provided a context for the documents that followed because they often were secondary sources describing the situation at point which contained none too subtle interpretations. The students tended to adopt these interpretations as their answers rather than to think the question through for themselves. In some units the compiler seemed to feel the need to have an expert give an overview that included a conclusion which seemed to be so brilliant and full of insight that none could deny that it must be "the" answer, which, in effect, became the textbook answer that insecure students were looking for. On the other hand, if two contradictory viewpoints were offered, students often went on thinking for themselves, though

some were tempted to borrow one as "proof" that their view was correct, until brought up short by contrary evidence.

Finally, and probably most important, the documents in each section must somehow relate to the larger purpose of the section and unit. Ultimately, they are effective only as they help to give students insight into the complexity of the central problem. Unless they make sense in the larger context and within general organization of the unit, they are of little importance no matter how appealing they may be in themselves, for delightful but isolated gems do not help students attain a greater depth of understanding of the problem upon which the unit focuses.

IV. General Format and Organization

The broad organization of all the units is generally the same. An introduction raises the general question of the unit and this is followed by a series of sections which reveal the different sub-questions or complexities which students have to consider before they can make a well-reasoned and informed consideration of the problem. The unit ends with some suggestions for further reading so that interested students can continue to study the problem.

For students who had used several Amherst Project units, the organization was easily recognizable and was looked upon as a kind of "formula." As one student put it, "Everyone knows that the opening of an Amherst unit is a simplified version of a very difficult and complex question; and only a fool would give his opinion in the first part of the unit." Nevertheless, a larger number of students were willing to do so, but the statement is probably a serious criticism of having one basic formula for organizing all units. The few units that did not follow the "formula," such as the units "Freedom and Authority in Puritan New England" and "Social Relations, Pre-Civil War," did not seem to be any less effective for having deviated from the pattern.

On the other hand, the loose-leaf format of the units makes it quite possible to reorganize the unit and many teachers did so. Teachers often deleted sections or documents that they found irrelevant or, for their classes, redundant. In some cases they added documents or created their own sections, often concerned with local issues that were relevant to the problem of the unit. Occasionally, teachers decided to pass out the unit section by section in whatever order made sense to them. Some teachers inserted sections from other Amherst units that they considered relevant to the unit at hand. In short, they designed their own unit for their own classes. Most, however, followed the organization of the unit as suggested in the teachers manual, but in almost all cases the compiler of the unit encouraged teachers to feel free to improvise and not to be restrained by the organization. Every indication was that teachers appreciated this.

Certain aspects of the organization of the units evoked strong feelings from a few teachers. Some were concerned when a particular section that was logical to discuss as an entity was too long to be read in one evening's assignment. Some wanted the student manual to contain more guidance from the editor, such as "questions to keep in mind" while reading a section, or summaries of important points at the end of each section. It is interesting to note that in general the teachers who made these last suggestions were not as experienced with using the Amherst units and discovery learning. It is also notable that considerably more teachers than students thought that such additions were necessary. Many teachers felt that

having each section contain a certain appeal was as important as having the central question of the unit developed in a logical way. Several teachers contended that no section should be "cut and dried" and that each should contain a certain amount of controversy and color.

Teachers seemed to prefer having the sections arranged in chronological order, no doubt because this organization is familiar to them. The units that seemed to pose the most problems as to general organization were those spanning a long period of time where it was difficult to provide adequate context for each time period, and those which revealed the nuances of the central question by raising different but related topics in a non-chronological way, thus making transitions between sections more difficult. The latter organization also caused difficulties because teachers and students had a hard time adjusting to a relatively unfamiliar organization and because the topics sometimes raised irrelevant but interesting side questions (e.g. in "The Vote" unit they wanted to talk about Communism in general when the topic at issue was voting patterns in the Soviet Union, or in the "Supreme Court" unit they wanted to talk about racial segregation when it was expected that they would be primarily concerned with the legal system in South Africa).

The units which seemed to be the easiest to organize and to explain to teachers were those which dealt with a single issue in a relatively short period of time (e.g. "Korea and the Limits of Limited War," "Embargo of 1807," "Hiroshima").

One difficulty which teachers often mentioned was the tendency of many units to stay with the same basic question too long or at least to discuss it in such a way that the subtle facts of the question escaped them. Thus complaints of redundancy were somewhat common. This could be a problem relating as much to the teacher's manual as to the general organization.

The organization thatseemed to be most effective started by outlining the problem in concrete terms often relating it to contemporary circumstances, continued by revealing in a logical manner the more subtle abstractions of the problem, and ended by clarifying the universal nature of the problem. Some students, especially the less able, experienced difficulties in relating the early, concrete sections to the later, more abstract sections. On the other hand, some students commented that the unit didn't make sense until after they had gotten into the abstract sections.

The organization of the unit proved to be an important factor in the success of the unit but due to the flexible nature of the format it did not seem to be nearly as crucial as whether or not the subject of the unit was one which appealed to and seemed relevant to the students.

V. Classification of Units

There are numerous ways in which the units can be classified. One is by the nature of the time dimension: whether the unit focusses on a particular incident in time, spans various time periods, or focusses on a particular period of time in the traditional historical manner. A second is by how close the period in time being dealt with is to the present. A third is the type of subject dealt with in the unit: whether the subject matter is largely political, economic, diplomatic, constitutional, ideological, biographical, etc. Units may also be classified by the nature of the general problem posed by the unit: the dilemma of balancing individual freedom with social order, the problem of decision making, the dilemma of national power in international relations, the problem of understanding vari-

ous processes of social and institutional dynamics, the relationship between perception and knowledge, and the perception of how ideas change over a period of time. Finally, units may be classified by the knowledge, skills, or affective objectives that it is envisioned students should gain from studying each unit. It is possible to do this, and it has been done, but all the evidence from teachers' reports, student evaluations, tests, and other feedback indicates that the effectiveness of the units is generally not dependent on any of these factors. What seems more important is whether the unit has a well-conceived point which is made clearly relevant to contemporary students. Ultimately, if the unit is concerned with value questions that are of importance to students and for which insights can readily be attained by studying historical situations in which the same value questions were of concern, the unit constructed with appropriate material works and works well. Invariably, the units that are not successful either are not relevant to student concerns or the material chosen is not appropriate to their interests or ability.

It is true that students are more immediately interested in a contemporary unit such as "Why Watts?" than they are in a unit more distant in time, such as "God's Providence in Puritan New England". But it is also true that when the students saw that the point of the "God's Providence" unit was not Puritan life, but how and why a society's view and use of an idea changes, when, in other words, they saw that the experience of the Puritans could give them some insight into how and why ideas--including contemporary ideas--change over a period of time, they were fascinated. The readings were somewhat too difficult or redundant, but that is another problem. The point is that the reports indicate that most teachers and students saw this as a relevant question in which the Puritans were used only as a vehicle for getting to that question.

It is true that a unit dealing with a particular incident in time is easier to develop than one which spans time, but either fail or succeed depending on whether they are made relevant and have appropriately readable materials. This does not mean that units have to be made relevant to contemporary headlines or magazine articles. Relevance to students in junior and senior high school is much more sophisticated and deeper than mere current events. The units that were most effective, that "hit home", involved the students with moral questions, with irresolvable value questions, with questions that helped them to understand better how society functions and how man--man they can empathise with--grapples with problems, dilemmas, tragedies, and ultimately, with life. It matters little what the problem is as long as it is believable and understandable, and as long as the students see it as being important to them because it will help them to arrive at a better understanding of themselves as human beings and of the society in which they function. Everything points to the conclusion that students learn facts and develop skills more effectively, though not more efficiently, through discovery learning than by any other approach to the learning of history. This is no doubt due to the fact that facts and skills become necessary tools in the process of inquiring into an important and relevant question. If the larger problem of the unit does not seem relevant to them, if they do not see it as a universal condition of man, what they seem to learn about the problem or how they handle it becomes transitory. Evidence of this is best revealed when students use several units over a year's time, units which are related to each other and which contain insights and ideas that can be transferred from one to the other. As the degree of transfer is one important measure of the effectiveness of learning, it is not surprising that the greatest degree of transfer seemed to result from those units which had the greatest impact on the students' thinking.

Of course what is relevant and important to one group of students--or to each individual student--is not necessarily so to another. But there are units which most students and teachers praised highly because they were both appealing to read and were full of potential insights into man and society.

VI. Teacher's Manual

The Teacher's Manual can be a crucial factor in determining whether or not the unit is used effectively in the classroom. The best units have failed with teachers who have misunderstood the point of a unit or have been unable to raise the questions which were implicit in the unit. More fundamentally, the units have failed when teachers failed to see themselves in essentially different roles in the classroom than is traditional.

The Teacher's Manual is designed to do everything possible to guarantee the success of a unit in the classroom by communicating to the teacher: the purpose of the unit; the rationale behind its structure; the large questions it raises; the strategies that might be used in class in coping with the questions; and the potential of the unit, if used properly, for generating intellectual excitement in teachers and students alike. Needless to say, this is a difficult task and in the attempt more teacher's manuals have failed than have succeeded.

Part of the difficulty has to do with the diverse nature of the teachers with whom we try to communicate. Some teachers, because of a lack of experience or confidence, want and probably need a great deal of guidance. The problem is that, if a Manual bows to their desires, it runs the risk of offending the more experienced and confident teachers who want to develop their own strategies for their own classes. We have always tried to make it clear that we welcome original approaches not suggested in the Manual, but we have also found that in many instances this invitation for creativity on the teacher's part causes them to ignore the Teacher's Manual and try to do things with the unit which it is simply not designed to do. The contempt that many teachers have for teachers' manuals in general caused a number of teachers to give the Teacher's Manuals we developed little more than a perfunctory glance.

The Teacher's Manuals were, however, more often misused than ignored. Part of the reason for this can probably be ascribed to their basic design, especially in the early stages of the Project when the format presented a day-by-day approach. Clearly, this caused teachers to think that "the lesson" had to be completed in one day, and they often became confused and resentful when they couldn't "cover" that segment of the unit in one class period, accusing the author of the manual of expecting too much. This also made some teachers disregard a number of relevant questions which students would raise in class merely because these had not been anticipated in the Manual and because the teacher felt compelled, as in the traditional textbook, to move on to the next day's lesson so as not to "get behind." It took us some time to realize the error of our ways, but we eventually changed the format to a more flexible section-by-section review and analysis of the unit. We then suggested that the number of days spent on each section would depend on the nature of the class and the character of their inquiry. The attempt to communicate to teachers that in the process of inquiring they would have to be flexible, open-minded learners themselves--question-askers rather than answer-givers--was not easy. Teachers who had been playing the roles of didactic, worldly fonts of knowledge were now in effect being asked to be learners in front of their students. This was often a difficult adjustment to make. As a result,

they often imposed the questions on the students, implying that an answer existed which was universally acceptable to the academically sophisticated, rather than inviting the students to raise their own questions about the material. Just as they had been expected to "cover" American history, they also felt it necessary to cover--even in order--the questions raised in the Teacher's Manual. And the consequence was that many classes became dreary recitations, as the students took up and answered one question after another. The students did not in many cases learn much about the nature of questions when teachers indiscriminately treated factual questions and values questions in the same manner, as if there were clear-cut answers for both.

We tried to encourage teachers to go outside the Student's Manual for other evidence if the Manual seemed to provide insufficient evidence for answering a question that was raised. But outside the bibliography at the end of the Student's Manual, we too often gave them little clue as to where they might go for help. Even in those instances where this was done, teachers and students were often frustrated by inadequate school libraries, and they had to fall back on the documents in the unit.

All of the Teacher's Manuals attempted to point out key documents and to explain their significance. Too often this became the major part of the Teacher's Manual, and some teachers resented having documents explained to them in a patronizing manner.

Their main criticism, however, had to do with the lack of alternative suggestions for classroom strategies. They seemed to agree that sketchy Teacher's Manuals which merely reviewed the basic structure of a unit and suggested possible conclusions were next to worthless and frustrating. In fact, suggesting possible conclusions was also dangerous. It was not necessarily a sign of success when the students concluded what the author of the Teacher's Manual "hoped for." In too many cases the students were driven to the conclusion by the teacher, and the point of the whole approach--learning from the process of inquiring--was completely lost. The Teacher's Manual which suggested open-ended questions and the various uses of the evidence seemed to work best in keeping the teachers and students on the right track. In other words, those Teacher's Manuals which emphasized the process of inquiry rather than the possible product served everyone best. Indeed, those Teacher's Manuals that had a tone of delight in the pursuit of an intriguing question and discussed the nuances of the process, those that emphasized the mystery of the problem rather than the solutions, inspired many teachers, and as a result, the classes, themselves, based on genuine questions, became inspirational. The teacher and students were then inquiring together into a baffling question, as opposed to having the students make guesses as to the teacher's "answer" which he himself had found in the Teacher's Manual.

Just as there was an unfortunate tendency by many teachers to "cover" the questions in the Teacher's Manual one by one, so too did many teachers have the students take up each of the documents in order. Many classrooms became "read and tell" recitations, in which the point, as an end in itself, seemed to be to summarize what each document said, an exercise which might have improved the reading skills of the students but did not help them arrive at the important questions of the unit. The document-by-document approach invariably failed, and the teachers were not explicitly warned of inevitable doom if it were used. The crux of the problem is that teachers have been trained to see questions, topics, and evidence as content to be "covered" rather than used.

The most successful classes raised a question which could be considered with the evidence at hand and let the students analyze and use those documents which

they found useful in dealing with the question. They thus learned how to use evidence in researching possible answers to a question.

The better Teacher's Manual warned teachers of topics to avoid and made it clear what the unit, with the sources it had, could not do as well as what it was intended to do. The tendency to try to pose questions of a controversial nature, simply because they sparked the interest of students, was unproductive if the unit was not designed to give the students some evidence to help them grapple with that question. What most teachers soon came to see was that the units are not random collections of documents similar to publications they had seen in the past, but were rather put together with a particular pedagogical purpose in mind. If that purpose were ignored, the unit would more likely not be put to its best use.

In summary, the most baffling, broadest problem which we face in writing the Teacher's Manual is that many teachers have preconceived notions as to what history teaching should be, and the Teacher's Manuals are not likely to change ingrained attitudes. As noted before, if teachers thought that questions and documents should be "covered" rather than considered as tools for research purposes, the use of a unit tended to be fruitless. If they were not comfortable as learners, as inquirers themselves, they spent most of their time giving answers to questions, often culled from the Teacher's Manual, that students did not understand nor care about. If teachers saw history as a set of conclusions rather than as an infinite number of questions, they taught the units as means to one conclusion rather than as condiderations of universal questions with no certain answers. If they felt uncomfortable with ambiguity, so did their students. If they saw their students as receptacles of knowledge rather than as active and independent inquirers, the classes were meaningless. In short, teachers who saw people, society, history--indeed, life--in the simple terms found in traditional textbooks could not be helped much by any Teacher's Manuals. The irony of it is that those who by nature and inclination were inquirers themselves and thus needed the Teacher's Manuals least were the ones who put them to best use.

Gary Baker

APPENDIX E

AMHERST PROJECT WORKSHOPS

	Place	Number of Participants	Source of Support	Purpose
1965				
1.	Amherst College	8	U.S.O.E. Cooperative Research	Inquiry Learning Workshop
2.	Amherst College	9	U.S.O.E. Cooperative Research	Inquiry Learning Workshop
1966				
3.	Denver	15	NDEA, Title XI--Cooperative Research	Inquiry Learning Workshop
4.	Chicago	15	NDEA, Title XI--Cooperative Research	Inquiry Learning Workshop
5.	San Francisco-Berkeley	15	NDEA, Title XI--Cooperative Research	Inquiry Learning Workshop
6.	Amherst College	16	NDEA, Title XI--Cooperative Research	Inquiry Learning Workshop
7.	Amherst College	16	NDEA, Title XI--Cooperative Research	Inquiry Learning Workshop
8.	Rochester, New York	27	University of Rochester, New York State Department of Education	Inquiry Learning Workshop
1967				
9.	Miami	23	Dade County (Florida) Public Schools	Inquiry Learning Workshop
10.	Amherst College	28	U.S.O.E. Cooperative Research	Inquiry Learning Workshop
1968				
11.	Amherst College	24	NDEA, Title XI	NDEA Institute Directors
12.	Berkeley-Oakland	32	NDEA, Title XI	NDEA Institute Directors
13.	Racine, Wisconsin	26	NDEA, Title XI	NDEA Institute Directors
1969				
14.	Dallas	40	Cooperative Research--Dallas, Irving, Highland Park School Districts	Education Development Team
15.	Boston	8	EPDG (U.S.O.E.)	Inner City Materials Development
16.	Indiana University	18	U.S.O.E.--American Historical Association	A.H.A. History Education Project
17.	Port Washington, New York	34	Cooperative Research--Port Washington Public Schools	Education Development Team
1970				
18.	Sonoma State College	27	EPDG--California State Board of Education	Education Development Team
19.	Columbus, Ohio	20	North Central Association of Secondary Schools	School Principals
20.	Vancouver, Washington	35	EPDG--Vancouver Public Schools	Education Development Team
21.	University of Delaware	35	EPDG--A.H.A. History Education Project, Delaware School Districts, U. of Del.	Education Development Team
22.	Tulsa	30	EPDG--Tulsa Public Schools	Education Development Team

APPENDIX F

Talk by Richard H. Brown,
Conference of NDEA Institute Directors,
Washington, D. C.
December 12, 1965

THE AMHERST PROJECT WORKSHOPS IN DISCOVERY LEARNING: AN INSTITUTE "ON THE ROAD"

It is a pleasure to be here on this panel of the "lunatic fringe" and to tell you a bit about the kind of institute we have proposed. I have a feeling as I look around that some of you who have been on the circuit in places like Denver have heard some of this before; I hope you will bear with me. I can assure you that I am as anxious to stop talking and get started as any of you.

Since our institute is tied in directly with the Amherst Project I want at the outset to tell you a bit about what that project is. In brief, we are one of the curriculum research centers supported by the Office of Education, ours being, at last count, the only one dealing exclusively with the study of history. Our particular province is to investigate the implications for the study of history of discovery or inquiry learning - that is to say, of the modern theory of learning which suggests that the student learns most effectively by being asked not to master a set of alleged "facts" or conclusions to which the scholars have come, but by being given evidence, asked to formulate the questions himself, and to work his way to his own conclusions. The expectation is that he will learn thereby not so much a set of facts, as what a "fact" is and how one arrives at it. The hope is that he will learn to doubt, to ask questions, to perceive the limits of generalizations, and to see the relationship between hypothesis, evidence, and proof. We carry on our work by assembling groups of teachers at Amherst College in the summers to prepare experimental source material units which are then tried out by approximately seventy-five cooperating teachers in schools throughout the country the ensuing year. We try to assess as systematically as possible what happens - what you can and can't do with discovery learning in the study of history, what its implications are for the student learning, for the way a teacher teaches and the way a course is organized, and for the training of the teacher who will teach. We are by no means convinced that inquiry should constitute the sole content of a history course - we want to find out how best to tie history as narrative into it, how and when the student can most effectively be asked to read historical literature. But we are convinced that it offers a way of seeing a history course that can make it infinitely more valuable in the intellectual development of human beings than the traditional course has been.

In one way or another - and I can't stress this enough - "discovery" learning is the very basis of the revolution now going on in the schools. It is based on new work in the psychology of learning. It had its impact first, as you all know, in mathematics and the natural sciences. It now bids fair to produce major changes in history and the social studies. Curriculum development projects from one end of the country to the other, large as well as small, in history and the social studies as well as in other fields, are espousing it. In history nearly all the new materials now appearing on the market for use in the schools are directed toward it. The desperate need - and I use the word advisedly - is to equip teachers to use them. I can't help but think that in one way or another that is the ultimate challenge to all

the institutes. We are trying out only one way of doing it, based partly on our own needs, and on our own very limited experience.

We learned ourselves the hard way that it makes no sense to produce materials without facing up to the question of how they will be taught. Accordingly we held in Amherst last summer two pilot workshops in discovery learning in history for teachers who are using our materials this year. What we will be doing with our Title XI grant is, basically, expanding that program - carrying the workshops "on the road" to different parts of the country, holding some of them during the term-time this coming spring. We expect to hold a one-week workshop in the Denver area in mid-March, at which the Jefferson County school district will be host; a one-week workshop in Chicago in late March, with the Laboratory School at the University of Chicago and possible some of the public schools as hosts; a one-week workshop in the San Francisco Bay area in April with the Berkeley school district and some of our friends at the University of California as hosts; and two more one-week workshops in Amherst next summer. For all these our project staff will be the staff of the institute. We expect to have in each workshop fifteen people, ten or eleven teachers, two or three administrative personnel, and one or two school board members. The program of each will be modeled on the program of the workshops we held last summer. In those we stumbled on some rather suggestive things and we frankly want to take a further look at them as we carry on our institute workshops.

The "pitch" we made to all the participants - and we will make the same one again because it was a wholly honest pitch - was an invitation to join with members of our staff in investigating what discovery learning means and what strategies make it work in the classroom. Our staff was composed (and will be again) of a psychologist trained in the psychology of learning, an experienced and wise high school teacher-administrator, a high school teacher who had spent the previous year visiting classes in which discovery learning was being attempted, a professor of American Studies who doubles in admissions work and spends much of his time going between the schools and colleges (viewing imaginatively the bridge between the two) and an orthodox historian. Mornings the workshop participants joined the staff in observing an average class of students working with one of our units, a study of containment policy and the Korean War. The class was taught by a young teacher who offered himself as a willing target rather than an exemplar. After each day's class and a ten-minute break the group re-assembled for a second hour in which the teacher, the students, the workshop participants, and the project staff - bringing their different insights to bear - pulled the class apart for an hour, analyzing what had happened. The teacher started out by telling the group what he had tried to do in the class and why; students responded with their frank reactions to what had happened; workshop participants and staff questioned both and were questioned in turn as to their reactions to what they had watched.

Nothing could have been more dramatic - and more eye-opening to all of us - than the reaction of the students to thus being made a part of the total educational enterprise, rather than merely its objects. Their comments were so penetrating that many of the workshop participants found it difficult to believe that they were in fact an average class, representing a wide range of test scores and grade-averages. Not only were they keen critics of the class, but they became as well adept at self-criticism; and it soon became clear to all who were watching that the second hour of the class had every bit as important a pedagogical function as the first. It was in

that hour that the students came to share a genuine sense of the nature of the intellectual enterprise in which they were involved - a genuine sense of what it is to inquire.

After the second hour the "class" broke up, but students were frequently seen on the campus as much as an hour and a half later still talking with each other, with the teacher, and with the workshop participants about the class, and about the Korean War. By the second week they had divested all the surrounding libraries of books on the Korean War, and they were coming to class armed with great quantities of evidence from outside the unit, without ever having been asked to do so. They had had, as some of them and some of their parents later reported, the most exhilirating experience in their academic lives.

Afternoons the workshop participants themselves became the "students" in single-day classes using a variety of different kinds of discovery learning materials and taught each day by a different teacher who came in from outside to teach the class. The workshop staff observed. A second hour was reserved, as in the morning, for a discussion among the teacher, the "students," and the workshop staff as to what had happened and why. While the format was thus much the same as in the morning, this time the workshop participants found themselves experiencing "discovery learning" as students; and at the same time the afternoon classes treated both the workshop participants and the staff to the chance to see four different personalities and teaching styles, inviting as a result not only recognition that different styles and personalities can use the method successfully, but also, as the week wore on, an increasingly analytical discussion of elements that seemed repeatedly to be producing moments of success and of those that seemed repeatedly to be producing failure.

One evening was reserved for a discussion led by a historian outside the project of the nature and philosophy of history - with the implication of that nature for teaching kept very much in the forefront. The discussion drew on reading such as Muller's The Uses of the Past, Dollard's Caste and Class in a Southern Town, Mills' The Sociological Imagination, Bloch's The Historian's Craft, and Bruner's On Knowing, which the workshop participants had been asked to do before arriving in Amherst. Other evenings in Amherst were devoted to meetings with the writers, who were working on the new units which the workshop people are trying out this year. For these we expect to substitute in our "roadshow" discussions of "discovery learning" materials, their nature and types - discussion for which, if possible we shall invite in people who are working on materials other than our own.

It remains to be seen how successful such a workshop method really is; we are seeing results which seem, on the whole, to be heartening as we visit last summer's participants in their classes this year. It does seem safe to say that few of the workshop participants - and certainly none of the project staff - will ever look at teaching, at their own role in a classroom, or at students in quite the same way again.

So much for the program; now I want to make several observations about it and then I will be through. First, in planning it it was our view that we could not hope to educate uneducated teachers in one week or six; that we could hope only to take on those who were already educated and reorient them by inviting them to join us in taking a new view of the essence of history as a discipline and of what could be done

with it in a history classroom. We wanted not just to "give 'em a little more education," trusting blindly to the old American notion that any education is a good thing; we wanted rather to give them an experience they would never forget and that would lead them to rethink their own role in a history classroom.

Secondly, while our workshops are devoid of "content" in the traditional sense, they are in fact built on the hypothesis that our Cooperative Research Project seeks to investigate, namely the hypothesis that the most important content of a history course is not the facts or the conclusions of the historians but the process of inquiry which the historian uses. It is this notion, it seems to us, which informs and gives meaning to what is all too often a tired cliche that scholarship and teaching are part and parcel of the same thing, and that for a person to be a good teacher he must in some sense of the word be a scholar. It is this notion too, it seems to us, which informs another cliche closer to home for all our purposes, and this is the idea that, properly conceived, content and method cannot be separated - or content and "transfer," to use the latest euphemism. We think we are talking "content," but admittedly it is not content seen in the traditional sense. It is a content which is absolutely inseparable from method.

Thirdly, we look forward to the opportunity to carry the workshops into the schools themselves. On the basis of our experience last summer we have a feeling that in talking about discovery learning we may in fact be talking about something that involves the whole way one perceives the educational process, and we think it important, therefore, to confront at one time not only teachers but people in administration and school board members - insofar as possible from the same or contiguous districts - people who are responsible for such things as scheduling and purchasing, for creating the conditions in which the teacher teaches. We have had the most cordial and gratifying support from those school systems most directly involved which will provide us with students and facilities, as well as from numerous others which will be paying out of in-service training funds for the hire of substitute teachers to release teachers who will participate. We think it is vitally important to develop this kind of cooperation effort. Finally on this score, and most important - and I say this with all humility as a historian who until a year and a half ago had not set foot in a high school classroom since the day he left - all our experience in our own project has seemed to suggest that in the last analysis it is difficult to talk meaningfully about teaching and learning without going into the schools in which it takes place to see what is going on there, and without dealing, in the last analysis, with the students whose development is, after all, the only point of the whole process.

The implications of some of the things we will be trying are, I think, considerable, not least of all for the whole way one thinks about teacher training and retraining. Ours is at best a kind of pilot operation. We are looking forward to inviting in school people and people from both the history and education departments at the University of Chicago and the University of California, to give us their honest appraisals of what it is we are doing and how we could do it better. We are far from convinced that we have the answers, but we hope at least that we may be trying some suggestive and perhaps useful things. We take a position of nothing ventured, nothing gained.